is a very dangerous issue that is occurring there. The counterterrorism risks that are posed by ISIL in Iraq and Syria are dramatic and deserve a lot of attention. We have spent time on the floor talking about what has happened in Ukraine and Russia's illegal actions with regard to Crimea, and they deserve attention. We have spent some time even talking about the Chinese ambitions in the Asian-Pacific region and their illegitimate territorial claims.

The only thing I am saying is that what happens in the Western Hemisphere matters too—that human rights violations in Venezuela are just as important as human rights violations in Africa or Europe or Asia or any other part of the world. Sometimes I feel as if they do not get the attention they deserve around here.

This is our opportunity to show that this hemisphere is important and that what happens in our hemisphere matters. I want you to know that the people of Venezuela—particularly those students and those who desire a democratic and respectful future—they are watching. Every single time we do something on Venezuela here, we hear it in phone calls, on Twitter, on Facebook, in visits to our office and in emails and in letters. They are watching, they are listening, and they are aware.

What I want people in the world to know and people in the hemisphere to know is that America does not simply care about stability; we also care about democracy and freedom and about human rights. This is our opportunity to put action where our words are.

So I sincerely hope that when we return here in about 8 or 9 days we can find a way forward to get a vote on this. If we are unable to do this through the unanimous consent process, which they call a hotline, my intentions are to come to this floor and offer it as what they call a live unanimous consent, where I will stand here and do what the Senator from Texas just did—or tried to do—with regard to the IRS issue.

I intend to come to this floor and propose this bill and ask for unanimous consent. If someone objects, then we will have a debate about that objection. Should that fail, then I hope we can have a vote scheduled. I promise it will not take any more than 15 minutes—or 10 if you want to limit the vote to 10 minutes. But let's get this done.

This is important. We have worked this the appropriate way. Often times, people come to the floor in the Senate and they pull a bill out of their pocket and say: Let's file it for messaging purposes. This is real. This is impactful. The House has already passed a version of this. Doesn't this issue at least deserve 10 minutes of the Senate's time?

So we are going to try to get this done one more time through unanimous approval. And we are going to work over the next 10 days to hopefully get everyone's support. But if we cannot do it that way, I hope we can schedule a vote on the Senate floor on this bill so we can go after and sanction those criminals in Venezuela who are stealing the money of the Venezuelan people and using the strength and the power of that government to attack their own people. I hope that will be a priority for us when we return. It deserves that attention.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this issue today, and I wish for all my colleagues the next 10 days will be fruitful in your return to your home States, and I look forward to working with you on these issues when we return.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

MASSACHUSETTS BUFFER ZONE

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, since 1973, when the Supreme Court decided that a woman's right to choose was constitutionally protected, women's health clinics across the country have been targeted by violence and other criminal activities by extremists.

The crimes are alarming: harassment, arson, acid attacks, obstruction, violent threats, and even murder. Women's safety has been repeatedly put at risk simply for exercising a constitutional right.

In the past 10 years, there have been approximately 75,000 incidents of violence against abortion providers in the United States. That is unacceptable. We should always remember that each of these victims of violence has a name, a family, and a story.

In 1994, a gunman killed two people and wounded five others at two clinics in Massachusetts. One of these victims was 25-year-old Shannon Lowney, a daughter of public schoolteachers, a beloved sister, and a volunteer who worked domestically and internationally with poor families and children.

Shannon worked as a receptionist and Spanish translator at Planned Parenthood in Brookline, MA. She worked there not for the pay but because she fundamentally believed women had a right to affordable health care. She wanted to do her part to ensure that patients at a vulnerable and stressful time in life were greeted with a smile. Five days after Christmas in 1994 she was fatally shot in the neck at a Planned Parenthood clinic by an extremist protester.

Shannon's story is just one of the many tragedies caused by violence against women exercising their rights.

In 2007, after the laws on the books proved inadequate, Massachusetts ensured that there would be fair and balanced laws that created a buffer zone of 35 feet around the entry of reproductive health care facilities.

This law was intended to protect people such as Shannon and the thousands of women and staff who visit and work

The buffer zone law worked. Massachusetts women could exercise their fundamental right to health care without running a gauntlet of abuse. According to a survey of reproductive health care centers across the country, a majority of facilities with buffer zones experienced a decrease in criminal activity after the buffer zone was instituted.

Today the Supreme Court of the United States took away those buffer zones of safety when it struck down the Massachusetts buffer zone law, effectively undoing the historic progress we have made in ensuring that women are protected when accessing reproductive health care and exercising their constitutional rights.

Today's Supreme Court ruling puts women at risk simply for exercising their constitutional rights. Shannon's brother Liam visited me on the day that this case was argued before the Supreme Court. Their family is representative of what has happened across this country in terms of the endangerment of women when they seek to exercise their constitutional rights.

So today is a sad day. It is not just a sad day for America but in particular for Shannon's family because they put a lot on the line to ensure that this case was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Court's decision makes it more difficult for States to guarantee women's reproductive rights and more likely that acts of violence and intimidation against women seeking reproductive health care will occur.

With reproductive rights under attack across the country like never before, it is imperative that we ensure the basic safety of all women and staff at Planned Parenthood and other health facilities.

We should be expanding access to safe reproductive health care for women, not restricting it. That is unfortunately what today is going to represent in the history of health care for women in our country.

The Presiding Officer is a national leader on these issues, fighting for the rights of women. I stand with her and with the other Members of the Senate but, more importantly, also with ordinary families across this country and Planned Parenthood and all the women in Massachusetts and this country who believe every woman seeking reproductive health care should be safe and protected.

I am proud that all Massachusetts law enforcement officials will continue to use every legal tool available to ensure the safety and privacy of women and clinic staff. Today is a historic day. Unfortunately, it is one of which our country should not be proud.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERRORIST THREATS

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, Senator McCain and I have decided to come down before the Fourth of July break to talk about two issues that are very important to our national security.

The first issue I would like to discuss is the threat we face as a nation from terrorist safe havens in Syria and now Iraq.

The President has indicated in recent days that it is unacceptable to allow terrorist organizations such as ISIS to have safe havens from which to launch attacks against our country.

Mr. President, we agree. What are you doing about it? I understand Iraq is complicated. I understand you would need a new government in Iraq that Sunnis could buy into to probably turn Iraq around. That is a problem, but that is a separate problem from safe havens that can be used to launch attacks against the United States. Please do not turn over to the Iraqi politicians the timeline as to whether we will act to protect ourselves.

This is the FBI Director: "My concern is that people can go to Syria, develop new relationships, learn new techniques and become far more dangerous, and then flow back."

Americans are now in Syria. Some 7,500 foreign fighters from 50 countries have gone to Syria. They are now in Iraq. The Islamic State in Iraq and Syria was kicked out by Al Qaeda. These are the most extreme people on the planet. They have now gone into Iraq and taken large territories and up to \$500 million in resources. They had a \$30 million-a-year budget. They have more money than they ever dreamed of. Their desire to hit the homeland is growing. Last week the leader of this group said: We will be coming to America next.

Mr. President, do not use the political problems in Baghdad as an excuse not to act when it comes to denying safe havens to terrorists who have espoused attacking our country. Where is your plan to dislodge these people in Syria and Iraq? Where is your plan to deal with the safe haven issue? Where is your plan to hit a terrorist organization that is desirous of hitting us?

Mr. President, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot alert us as a nation that we are threatened by a safe haven in Iraq and Syria and do nothing about it. I understand the political complexities that exist in Iraq, but I also understand the need to deal with the safe haven issue. What do you envision as a solution to the safe haven problem in Syria and Iraq? When are we going to act? Is there no military component available to the United States to hit a terrorist organization

that is operating out in the open in Syria and Iraq, that represents a direct threat to our homeland?

Mr. President, now is the time for you to come up with a plan to deal with the safe havens. That issue is separate and apart from dealing with the political complications and the melt-down in Iraq. You have said and the Director of National Security Mr. Clapper has said that Syria is an apocalyptic state; it is in a very bad way; that the jihadists in Syria represent a direct threat to our homeland.

The same jihadists in Syria have moved now into Iraq. Three years ago when Senator McCain was urging airstrikes and that a safe zone be established, there were fewer than 1,000 foreign fighters in Syria. Today we think there are up to 26,000 ISIS types in Syria. Now they are moving to Iraq at lightning speed, taking town after town, amassing resources in terms of military hardware and money that will make them not just a terrorist organization but a terrorist army.

Mr. President, there is a terrorist army on the march in Iraq and Syria. They have indicated they want to hit our Nation. They want to strike us in the region, throughout the world, and here at home. You seem to have no plan. We want to help you. We understand this is complicated, but you, as Commander in Chief above all others, have a duty to come up with a solution to this problem. You have defined the problem well, but you have done nothing to solve the problem. We stand ready to help you solve that problem.

Now, as we try to figure out where to go in Iraq and what is the right strategy, the one thing that is important to me is not to rewrite history. I do not want to dwell on the past, but I am not going to sit on the sidelines and let this administration—which, as Senator Obama, Senator Clinton, and Senator Kerry, was all over the Bush administration for the mistakes they made. That is the way the political process works.

When the Iraq war was going poorly on President Bush's watch, Senator McCain called for the Republican-appointed Secretary of Defense to resign. I would argue that Senator McCain above all others has been consistent when it comes to Iraq. It does not matter who is making the mistake; if he believes one is being made, he will speak up.

The line that there were just a few dead-enders in Iraq was not true. The reason we knew it was not true is that Senator McCain and I went to Iraq numerous times. The first time we went, we were in an SUV with a three-car convoy. We went down to Baghdad, had dinner, and went shopping. Every time thereafter, the security was tighter, our ability to leave the base was restricted, and the people on the ground who were fighting the war were telling us: This thing is not going well. Every time we would hear from the Bush administration that the media was mis-

representing the truth and that this was just a few dead-enders, we knew better. We spoke up.

Abu Ghraib was a direct result of being overwhelmed by circumstances on the ground. We thought that once the Iraqi Army disbanded and Saddam Hussein was displaced, we would be able to handle Iraq with a few thousand troops. The Bush administration was wrong in that calculation. Senator McCAIN spoke up, and the surge did work.

To President Bush's undying credit: You corrected the mistakes that happened on your watch. You kept an open mind. You changed strategy because the strategy you originally pursued had failed.

President Obama, your strategy has failed. The idea of abandoning Iraq, disengaging politically and militarily, has come home to haunt us as a nation.

Senator McCain and I said back in 2011: If we do not leave a residual force behind as an insurance policy for our own national security interests, we will regret it.

Madam President, 10,000 to 15,000 soldiers, well placed, would have given the capacity to the Iraqi Army to allow them to be more effective, and what we see on the ground today would have never happened. I am convinced that ISIS would never be in Iraq the way they are today if there had been an American military component—10,000 to 15,000—providing capacity and expertise to an Iraqi army that is literally falling apart.

I am convinced today that if we had continued to push the Iraqi political system to reconcile, we would not be where we are today. Dave Petraeus and Ryan Crocker—one general and one diplomat—spent hours every day of the week practically pushing the Sunnis, the Shias, and the Kurds to solve their problems with the political process. It was working.

In 2010 we made a fateful mistake. We allowed Syria to go bad. Syria became the supply center for Al Qaeda in Iraq, which was on its back. In 2010 the surge had worked. Al Qaeda in Iraq, which was the predecessor to ISIS, was completely devastated. They are back in the game for three reasons: Syria became a failed state. We had a chance to stop that and did not. They were being resupplied from Syria with equipment and fighters. We decided to disengage from Iraq politically. We had a handsoff approach to the political problems in Baghdad. We withdrew our troops all from 2010 to 2011. Those three things became a perfect storm to lead us to where we are today.

We do want to look forward because looking backward does not solve the problem. But here is what we will not accept. We will not accept a rewriting of history. When this administration says the reason we have no troops in Iraq today is because of the Iraqis, that is an absolutely false statement.

In May of 2011 Senator McCAIN and I, at the request of Secretary Clinton,